



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/497,244      | 02/03/2000  | Russell Jarvors      | 3910.164            | 7255             |

7590

03/05/2003

LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD B. KLAR  
875 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
SUITE 2301  
NEW YORK, NY 10001

EXAMINER

DALENCOURT, YVES

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2635

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/497,244**

Applicant(s)  
**Russell Javors**

Examiner  
**Yves Dalencourt**

Art Unit  
**2635**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yves Dalencourt

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Richard B. Klar

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 3, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 2, 24, and 30

Identification of prior art discussed:

Sanders et al ( US 4,754,255 ) and Hai-Ming Wu ( US 4,925,427 )

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

We basically discussed the prior art cited in the last office action. Applicant argued that there is no reason to combine Sanders with Wu since Sanders is not in the toy environment. The examiner disagreed with the Applicant based on the claimed language. However, Applicant is going to amend again the proposed claims by filing a CPA in order to overcome the prior art rejection. The examiner will conduct further search upon receiving a formal amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required